

Is The Official Story of 9/11 an example of "ideological mystification"?

By Casey Wright. UC Berkeley Senior Thesis. Fall 2006. Advisor: Gary Wren

Dedicated to Brian Harvey of the NYFD, the 9/11 Hero who asked, “If the conspiracy theory is true, why isn't it front and center on every major news program?”

Table of Contents:

Introduction

1. THE RULING IDEOLOGY

2. QUESTIONING THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

3. OPERATION NORTHWOODS

4. THE 9/11 COMMISSION WAS SERIOUSLY FLAWED

5. ESTABLISHMENT PRESS DEBUNKS THE UNOFFICIAL THEORY

6. CONSPIRACY THEORIES

7. PUNISH ANYONE WHO REJECTS THE DOMINANT IDEOLOGY

8. THE INTERNET AS A REVOLUTIONARY PRESS

Appendix

Bibliography

[Full thesis with video clips available at www.MakePornNotWar.com]

INTRODUCTION

The research problem I am studying is whether the mainstream American media has told the true story of the attacks of September 11th, 2001, or has told a story that serves the interests of its owners. There are two dominate theories of what really happened. The first, known as The Official Story, was disseminated immediately after the attacks. This story is that 19 Arab hijackers associated with al-Qaeda attacked America. These terrorists attacked us because they hated our freedoms. The second story, which I will refer to as The Unofficial Story, claims that 9/11 was an inside-job, orchestrated by a treasonous cabal within the military-industrial complex, for the purposes of consolidating the power of the American empire. Through the theories of Marxist ideology, I will explore how these two antagonistic messages have competed in the sphere of American discourse. The Official Story has primarily been disseminated through mass-media channels that are demonstrably controlled by the ruling class of America. The Unofficial Story has primarily been disseminated through the Internet and through grass-roots communication, two modes of discourse that can be viewed as uncontrolled by the ruling class.

There are compelling reasons to believe either story. My goal in presenting this thesis is not to necessarily convince the reader of which story is true, but only to show that The Unofficial Story is definitely possible and should not be viewed as a mere "conspiracy theory." The plain fact that The Unofficial Story has received such a biased presentation by the American mass-media highlights the possibility that it might be true, and that the ruling class is actively attempting to hide this. Consider that a Zogby poll that took place in May of 2006 revealed that 42% of Americans believe that the government is covering up critical information that contradicts The Official Story of 9/11. 45% believe the attacks should be reinvestigated, and 55% have negative feelings about the way that the American media covered the unanswered questions and theories that challenged the official account.¹ So why isn't the mainstream media presenting a more balanced and investigative account of The Unofficial Story? They would certainly have plenty of customers.

As far as my biases go, until about 2004, I was not at all intrigued by The Unofficial Story. I was convinced to that it was a mere conspiracy theory. I was anti-war, but convinced that Arab hijackers had acted alone to attack the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Only after I realized that Bush was capable of lying about WMDs, and of lying about Saddam's connections to al-Qaeda did I begin to wonder if he and his cabinet might have actually orchestrated 9/11. After reading Operation Northwoods² and also studying the possibility that the German Nazis may have orchestrated the Reichstag fire, I became more convinced that it was possible that 9/11 was an inside-job. Then after reading in the New York Times that the Gulf of Tonkin incident was probably staged, I began to seriously distrust the ability of mainstream American media institutions to disseminate accurate information, since it had taken 40 years for this information

to be publicized³. I began to view the Internet as a revolutionary medium for information sharing. I do not share the view that the Internet is less credible than the old media. After The New York Times easily disseminated false information about WMDs⁴ through Judith Miller's reporting, I doubt that I will ever trust those sources again.

For these reasons, I prefer to work empirically with the guiding question of "Qui Bono?" Due to the fact that the ruling ideology is primarily transmitted through mainstream channels, I will primarily rely on Internet sources that are the only published evidence of controversial and censored testimony. The fact that ideas that conflict with the ruling ideology might not be found in the establishment press does not detract from the validity of my thesis. Rather, this fact adds support to my claims.

The issue of what really happened on 9/11 is of great concern. Questioning 9/11 has become as dangerous as questioning Joseph McCarthy, and the stakes are just as high for the future of Free Speech in America. Our Founding Fathers warned us to always be on guard against domestic tyranny. We have a patriotic duty to examine this issue. The government has clearly demonstrated its capacity to lie about serious issues surrounding The War on Terror, so their simple assurances that "Osama Bin Laden is out to get us" are untrustworthy. Even if there appears to be no conclusive evidence of a Neocon conspiracy, this does not mean that one did not occur. To quote former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, "The absence of evidence is not the evidence of absence."⁵ While he spoke of the yet-to-be-found WMDs in Iraq, the quote could easily be applied to the search for evidence that might definitively verify The Unofficial Story.

THE RULING IDEOLOGY

*"KARL MARX makes different statements about ideology at different points in his career; however, his most straightforward statement about ideology appears in *The German Ideology*, which he wrote with Frederick Engels. Ideology itself represents the "production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness," all that "men say, imagine, conceive," and include such things as "politics, laws, morality, religion, metaphysics, etc." Ideology functions as the superstructure of a civilization: the conventions and culture that make up the dominant ideas of a society. The "ruling ideas" of a given epoch are, however, those of the ruling class: "The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of their dominance" ⁶*

That American ideology has been pruned to gloss over past atrocities perpetrated by the ruling class has been well-established by countless researchers. I will not spend time trying to establish whether or not that process occurs, but will ask if The Official Story of 9/11 is just another example in a long line of myths that tend to serve the interests of the ruling class while creating a false consciousness for working-class Americans. For the sake of this thesis, I will define “the ruling class” of America as a) the richest families, b) top politicians, c) top media moguls, and d) top military officers. The immense and semi-obsured influence of the Rockefeller family (the richest family in America and known for their immense influence over American affairs) can help us keep a picture in our minds of definite individuals who may be consciously attempting to influence American ideology to suit their interests. A candid quote from David Rockefeller can

give us a real sense of this process:

*"For more than a century ideological extremists at either end of the political spectrum have seized upon well-publicized incidents such as my encounter with Castro to attack the Rockefeller family for the inordinate influence they claim we wield over American political and economic institutions. Some even believe we are part of a secret cabal working against the best interests of the United States, characterizing my family and me as 'internationalists' and of conspiring with others around the world to build a more integrated global political and economic structure--one world, if you will. If that's the charge, I stand guilty, and I am proud of it."*⁷

The following allegations by filmmaker Aaron Russo don't seem too wild, given David Rockefeller's blunt statements. For PrisonPlanet.com, Paul Joseph Watson reports:

Hollywood director, producer and documentary film maker Aaron Russo, currently receiving a wave of plaudits for his latest release, America: From Freedom to Fascism, told The Alex Jones Show that Nicholas Rockefeller had personally assured him there was going to be an "event" that would trigger the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq eleven months before 9/11 took place.

Saying he had been approached many times by the Rockefellers and other members of the [Council on Foreign Relations] elite in an attempt to recruit him, Russo recalled a conversation that would come home to roost on September 11, 2001.

"Here's what I do know first hand - I know that about eleven months to a year before 9/11 ever happened I was talking to my Rockefeller friend (Nicholas Rockefeller) and he said to me 'Aaron there's gonna be an event' and he never told me what the event was going to be - I'm not sure he knew what the event was going to be I don't know that he knew that," said Russo.

Russo related how Rockefeller knew precisely what the event would lead to and which countries would be militarily targeted by the elite.

"He just said there's gonna be an event and out of that event we're gonna invade Afghanistan so we can run pipelines through the Caspian sea, we can go into Iraq to take the oil and establish bases in the middle east and to make the middle east part of the new world order and we're going to go after Venezuela - that's what's going to come out of this event."

"Eleven months to a year later that's what happened.... he certainly knew that something was going to happen."⁸

It is important to note that Nicholas's cousin, David Rockefeller, conceived and financed the building of the World Trade Center.⁹ The Rockefeller controlled Port Authority maintained control of the Twin Towers until just seven weeks prior to 9/11, when financier Larry Silverstein took over the lease.¹⁰ That is a remarkable coincidence in timing. Why hasn't this been investigated? It is quite possible that the Rockefellers, or other members of the ruling class, did orchestrate 9/11. If that was true, how would we know? Wikipedia says: "The combined personal

and social connections of the various family members are vast, both in America and throughout the world, including the most powerful politicians, public figures and top businessmen. Notable figures through Standard Oil alone have included Henry Flagler and Henry H. Rogers. Contemporary figures include, Henry Kissinger, Nelson Mandela, Richard Parsons (Chairman and CEO of Time Warner), C. Fred Bergsten, Peter G. Peterson (Senior Chairman of the Blackstone Group), and Paul Volcker.”¹¹ The following video clip succinctly demonstrates the Rockefeller connection to key think-tanks and institutions. Also apparent is Dick Cheney's secretive association with the Council on Foreign Relations, a fact he knowingly jokes about.

[YouTube search: Cheney + Rockefeller + CFR, or type in

http://www.youtube.com/v/yVF3q1go_8Q] These revelations, and the secrecy that surrounds them, add support to filmmaker Russo's allegations.

Marx would ask us to be suspicious of public testimony from members of the ruling class. Instead of accepting their pledges at face value, we should make deductions based upon their relationships to the modes of production:

"Empirical observation must in each separate instance bring out empirically, and without any mystification and speculation, the connection of the social and political structure with production. The social structure and the State are continually evolving out of the life-process of definite individuals, but of individuals, not as they may appear in their own or other people's imagination, but as they really are; i.e. as they operate, produce materially, and hence as they work under definite material

limits, presuppositions and conditions independent of their will."¹²

Two of the dominant material relationships of this era are the oil industry and the weapons industry. Oil and weapons are essential to the current American way of life. The recent record profit reports of the oil corporations are said to be the largest corporate profits of all time.¹³ The weapons industry also rakes in billions of dollars annually, primarily from American taxpayers. What would Marx say about Bush's cabinet, which is full of ex-oil industry moguls? And Bush's immediate family, who are heavily involved in arms dealing?¹⁴ The key realities of The War on Terror (dominance of the Middle East and massive military spending) happen to achieve key profit objectives of the oil and weapons industries.¹⁵ Is this merely a coincidence? Or are the "ruling ideas" of The War on Terror cover for the actual, covert objectives of the American ruling class? Consider that the boards of directors for media conglomerates often share members who also sit on the boards of directors for oil corporations.¹⁶ [see appendix .] For example, "Defense Donald Rumsfeld was on the board of the Tribune Company, owner of the Chicago Tribune, the Los Angeles Times, Newsday, and many other newspapers as well as TV stations."¹⁷ This is clear evidence of conflicting interests. Would you report that the war was for oil if you also held stock in oil companies? The primary disseminators of this ruling ideology are closely connected to the Bush administration and to the obscured ruling elite of America.¹⁸

The Unofficial Story of 9/11 is more congruent with Marxist theory than The Official Story. Students of Marxism should view The Official Story as obfuscation, until proven otherwise:

*"Since one goal of ideology is to legitimize those forces in a position of hegemony, it tends to obfuscate the violence and exploitation that often keep a disempowered group in its place (from slaves in tribal society to the peasantry in feudal society to the proletariat in capitalist society). The obfuscation necessarily leads to logical contradictions in the dominant ideology, which Marxism works to uncover by returning to the material conditions of a society: a society's mode of production."*¹⁹

The Official Story does "legitimize those forces in a position of hegemony." The Official Story is used to justify aggressive and territorial conquests by the American military. It has also been used to justify the suppression of the domestic population through the Patriot Act legislation. Foreign and domestic policies in the post-9/11 era both provide massive benefits to the ruling class of America.²⁰

QUESTIONING THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

President Eisenhower's farewell address to the nation provides a clear warning of the dangers of the military-industrial complex:

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination

endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals so that security and liberty may prosper together."²¹

In the spirit of taking nothing for granted, and knowing full well the history of deception by American presidents, it is clearly our right and duty to question The Official Story.

Historically, the American government has often been accused of allowing or staging attacks as pretexts for war. So why would any disinterested observer believe that this instance was different? Daniel Ellsberg, the renowned Pentagon Papers whistleblower, is a clear moral authority on the subject of staged attacks. His comments about 9/11 should cause us all to question The Official Story. When asked if he had looked into it, he said:

Actually, I have looked at a lot of that, and I'll tell you without going into it all which would take a lot of time, I find some of it very implausible and other parts of it quite solid, and there's no question in my mind that there's enough evidence there to justify a very comprehensive and hard hitting investigation of a kind that we've not seen, with subpoenas, general questioning of people, and raising the release of a lot of documents, there's no question that (D.E. chuckles) put it this way, very serious questions have been raised, about how much they knew beforehand and how much involvement there may have been. Is the, is an administration capable, humanly and physiologically of engineering such a provocation?

Yes, I would say that, I worked for such an administration myself, Johnson, ah, President Johnson put destroyers in harm's way in the Tonkin Gulf not only once, but several times, with the, with a lot of his people hoping that it would lead to a confrontation and claiming that it had. And could have resulted in the loss of many lives in the course of it.²²

Why isn't Ellsberg's testimony being splashed across the front pages of the New York Times?

He's a national hero, and this is clearly "news."

Another key reason to question the current regime is that in 2000, many members of Bush's cabinet, as well as other close associates, were involved in the neoconservative think-tank known as Project For a New American Century (PNAC). They published a document called "Rebuilding America's Defenses."²³ Interviewer Lorna Tychostup neatly sums up its key points:

They had a blueprint with core principles: defend the American homeland; fight and decisively win multiple, simultaneous major theater wars; perform the "constabulary" duties associated with shaping the security environment in critical regions; transform US forces to exploit the "revolution in military affairs." It spoke about the need for an event mimicking the attack on Pearl Harbor to consolidate the US public's support for rebuilding a military that could dominate the world. The PNAC document goes so far as to warn: "Further, the process of transformation [of the US military], even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor." And here we find ourselves.²⁴

PNAC recognized that after the fall of the Soviet Union, America had a chance to consolidate its role as the world's sole superpower. Part of this plan was to militarily dominate the Middle East, which, with it's vast oil reserves, was seen as a key strategic component of maintaining a dominant military. Given the fact that all members of this think-tank would soon be in power, isn't it remarkably coincidental that a "catastrophic and catalyzing event" took place under their watch? Isn't this what Eisenhower warned us about? Also, all members of PNAC were to profit enormously from their connections to the defense industries, as well as from their control of distributing defense contracts. So immediately on the face of it we should ask ourselves: which motive to perpetrate 9/11 appears to be stronger? The hijacker's alleged hatred of freedom, or PNAC's stated aim of world domination? As PNAC's plan has largely come to fruition, uninformed liberal critics of the Bush administration say they are "stupid" because there was not a real link between Iraq and al-Qaeda. Yet the "Rebuilding America's Defenses" document provides a real blueprint of recent events that proves this regime is much more calculating than they may appear.

OPERATION NORTHWOODS

The declassified Operation Northwoods²⁵ document shows that high-ranking American military

men have actively contemplated killing American citizens as a deceptive pretext for war with another country. The 1962 proposal by General Lemnitzer and the Joint Chiefs of Staff suggested blowing up American airliners and blaming it on Cuban terrorists:

An aircraft at Elgin AFB would be painted and numbered as an exact duplicate for a civil registered aircraft belonging to a CJA proprietary organization in the Miami area. At a designated time the duplicate would be substituted for the actual civil aircraft and would be loaded with the selected passengers, all boarded under carefully prepared aliases. The actual registered aircraft would be converted to a drone [a remotely controlled unmanned aircraft]. Take off times of the drone aircraft and the actual aircraft will be scheduled to allow a rendezvous south of Florida.

From the rendezvous point the passenger-carrying aircraft will descend to minimum altitude and go directly into an auxiliary field at Elgin AFB where arrangements will have been made to evacuate the passengers and return the aircraft to its original status. The drone aircraft meanwhile will continue to fly the filed flight plan. When over Cuba the drone will be transmitting on the international distress frequency a "May Day" message stating he is under attack by Cuban MiG aircraft. The transmission will be interrupted by destruction of the aircraft, which will be triggered by radio signal. This will allow ICAO [International Civil Aviation Organization] radio stations in the Western Hemisphere to tell the U.S. what has happened to the aircraft instead of the U.S. trying to "sell" the incident.²⁶

Operation Northwoods is clear evidence that the American military actively contemplated killing innocent American citizens in order to advance larger military strategies. The plan to blow up American jets and falsely blame a foreign power is also clear support for the possibility that 9/11 was an inside job. Whether or not this actually did happen on 9/11 may not be entirely clear, but it is by no means "outrageous" to wonder if that is in fact what happened. Much of the empirical evidence of the day does seem to support the idea that a modern version of Northwoods was actually carried out [see Michael C. Ruppert, Peter Dale Scott, David Ray Griffin's extensive analyses.]. This possibility also has clearly NOT been adequately examined by the mainstream media or by the 9/11 Commission. Wouldn't it be the scoop of the century to precisely investigate whether a modern Northwoods took place on 9/11? Why isn't this being done by our press? Furthermore, full and unbiased access to all evidence has been hindered by the American government. Most purveyors of The Unofficial Story wonder why all evidence has been kept secret if there truly is nothing to hide.

THE 9/11 COMMISSION WAS SERIOUSLY FLAWED

The Bush Administration resisted attempts to investigate 9/11, stating that an investigation would draw resources away from fighting the War on Terror.²⁷ After being forced to form a commission, the investigative body was stocked with people who had close ties to the oil industry and to Bush. One board member, Thomas Kean, has pertinent conflicts of interest. Kean has served on the Board of Directors of the National Endowment for Democracy, a long-time conduit of CIA covert operations abroad. Kean also has a history of investments that link him to Saudi Arabian investors who have financially supported both George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden in the past.²⁸ Another board member, Senator Max Cleland, resigned from the commission in protest. He has made several statements that indicate that the 9/11 Commission was not able to tell the whole truth, either consciously or due to Bush Administration secrecy:

If this decision stands [to limit 9/11 Commission access to White House documents], I, as a member of the commission, cannot look any American in the eye, especially family members of victims, and say the commission had full access. This investigation is now compromised.²⁹

"One of these days we will have to get the full story because the 9/11 issue is so important to America. But this White House wants to cover it up."³⁰

Regarding the 9/11 Commission: "It is a national scandal."³¹

Originally, Henry Kissinger, a man with an extensive history of deceiving the American citizenry, was selected to head the commission. After being forced to resign due to his checkered past and his refusal to divulge his client's list, Bush selected Phillip K. Zelikow, a man who specializes in the study of "public myths" as well as "searing" events. He also cowrote a book with Condoleezza Rice, so of course would be unsuitable to investigate whether the Bush regime was criminally involved in 9/11.

In a report for the Miller Center of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia in the Winter of 1999, Zelikow discussed the power of historical narratives and public presumptions:

This idea of "public presumption" is akin to William McNeill's notion of "public myth" but without the negative implication sometimes invoked by the word "myth." Such presumptions are beliefs (1) thought to be true (although not necessarily known to be true with certainty), and (2) shared in common within the relevant political community. The sources for such presumptions are both personal (from direct experience) and vicarious (from books, movies, and myths). For the generation who fought World War II, "Munich" is an example of such a public presumption; for the Founding Fathers, "Horatio" was a shared public presumption. The power of these presumptions derives from their role in facilitating conversation, analysis, and understanding.

Second, particularly "searing" or "molding" events take on "transcendent" importance and, therefore, retain their power even as the experiencing generation passes from the scene. In the United States, beliefs about the formation of the nation and the Constitution remain powerful

today, as do beliefs about slavery and the Civil War. World War II, Vietnam, and the civil rights struggle are more recent examples. Different sectors of the nation—regional, racial or ethnic, and economic—may derive different presumptions from their different memories of such events.

*Yet there is the pragmatic question of what a reader does when confronting a history of solely impersonal forces or impersonal masses, where he or she cannot point to the people or organizations that propel history. A history's narrative power is typically linked to how readers relate to the actions of individuals in the history; if readers cannot make a connection to their own lives, then a history may fail to engage them at all. In slightly different terms, readers are drawn to histories that help answer how the choices of individuals in the past either "affect me" or "instruct me."*³²

Zelikow's discussion of the power of "public myths" is roughly analogous to Marx's discussions of the power of ideology. Skeptics of The Official Story wonder if Zelikow only investigated issues surrounding 9/11 that might support a motivating "public myth." This, in conjunction with PNAC's need for a "new Pearl Harbor" to speed up their agenda casts a pall of doubt as to whether the 9/11 Commission properly investigated the crimes that took place on 9/11.

In an 11/17/05 op-ed piece for the online version of The Wall Street Journal, Louis Freeh, Director of FBI, 1993-2001 wrote:

Recent revelations from the military intelligence operation code-named "Able Danger" have cast

light on a missed opportunity that could have potentially prevented 9/11. Specifically, Able Danger concluded in February 2000 that military experts had identified Mohamed Atta by name (and maybe photograph) as an al Qaeda agent operating in the U.S. Subsequently, military officers assigned to Able Danger were prevented from sharing this critical information with FBI agents, even though appointments had been made to do so. Why?

Even the most junior investigator would immediately know that the name and photo ID of [lead 9/11 hijacker Mohammed] Atta in 2000 is precisely the kind of tactical intelligence the FBI has many times employed to prevent attacks and arrest terrorists. Yet the 9/11 Commission inexplicably concluded that it 'was not historically significant.' This astounding conclusion—in combination with the failure to investigate Able Danger and incorporate it into its findings—raises serious challenges to the commission's credibility and, if the facts prove out, might just render the commission historically insignificant itself. No wonder the 9/11 families were outraged by these revelations and called for a 'new' commission.

[T]he final 9/11 Commission report, released on July 22, 2004, concluded that "American intelligence agencies were unaware of Mr. Atta until the day of the attacks." This now looks to be embarrassingly wrong. Yet amazingly, commission leaders acknowledged on Aug. 12 [2005] that their staff in fact met with a Navy officer 10 days before releasing the report, who "asserted that a highly classified intelligence operation, Able Danger, had identified Mohammed Atta to be a member of an al Qaeda cell located in Brooklyn."³³

Considering such testimony from these highly reputable sources, the 9/11 Commission's findings can only be viewed as seriously flawed. At best, the commission was incapable of completing a full investigation. At worst, they were consciously attempting to cover up the truth while attempting to create a useful public myth to advance the interests of the Bush regime. It doesn't take much imagination to wonder if the "highly classified intelligence operation" Able Danger was approximately a modern version of Northwoods. Questions such as these go beyond the scope of this thesis, but should definitely be investigated. Unfortunately, it is hard to imagine that our intelligence bureaucracies are capable of adequately investigating themselves. Intelligence bureaucrats such as Sibel Edmonds who have attempted to share information that contradicts The Official Story have been placed under gag-orders. In a letter to the 9/11 Commission, she wrote:

I find your report seriously flawed in its failure to address serious intelligence issues that I am aware of, which have been confirmed, and which as a witness to the commission, I made you aware of. Thus, I must assume that other serious issues that I am not aware of were in the same manner omitted from your report. These omissions cast doubt on the validity of your report and therefore on its conclusions and recommendations.³⁴

ESTABLISHMENT PRESS DEBUNKS THE UNOFFICIAL THEORY

The Popular Mechanics book and article "Debunking 9/11 Myths" was published by Hearst Publishing, a company with a long history of publishing "yellow journalism."³⁵ The Hearst family is also directly related to the Rockefeller family. Their views are then quite explicitly the ideology of the ruling class. Are they trustworthy? Let's look at a similar event from the past to help us decide. Dr. Joseph Caddell is a lecturer on Military History at North Carolina State University in Raleigh. In December 2004, he published a history of military deceptions that have been used to influence domestic opinions. He has some interesting things to say about the nexus between politics and the propaganda press. His discussion of the sinking of the Maine in 1898 provides a clear historical example of how an ambiguous attack can be spun by the established press in order to advance ruling class interests.

In 1898 the destruction of the U.S.S. Maine in Havana Harbor created a situation where manipulation of information, primarily by the media rather than by the government, played a critical role in precipitating the war with Spain. The explosion, which destroyed the Maine on

the night of February 15, 1898, has been examined by investigators for the past 106 years. The conclusions are varied and often contradictory. The initial board of inquiry (March 1898) was unable to arrive at a definite conclusion.

American newspapers, however, were not so ambivalent. Nor were they restrained. Speculation as to the Spanish motives for destroying the Maine ran rampant. The strained relations between Madrid and Washington deteriorated even further. The “yellow press” did not cause the subsequent Spanish-American War by itself, but its role was seminal.

*This event provides an interesting case study where political, military, and economic interests intertwined to the point that one is hard pressed to segregate them. To what extent is the government responsible for correcting false impressions which appear in a free press? What if a government takes advantage of fabricated or manipulated data to serve its own policy ends?*³⁶

As a layman in the field of physics, I found the "Debunking 9/11 Myths" team to provide reasonable rebuttals to theories of controlled demolition. Yet the evidence of molten metal at Ground Zero is highly troubling, considering that kerosene fires should not have been able to melt steel. [Eyewitness Testimony of Melted Steel available at Google Video:

<http://video.google.com/googleplayer.swf?docId=-3060923273573302287&hl=en>]

Observations of molten metal might support The Unofficial Theory, which posits that controlled demolitions brought down the towers. One expert on steel characteristics, Kevin Ryan of Underwriters Laboratories, voiced concerns with the official explanation for how the World

Trade Center collapsed, given that no steel-framed skyscraper had ever collapsed due to fire. He was fired from his job. If experts who criticize The Official Story are terminated from their positions, it is not hard to imagine why others who agree might remain silent. It is therefore important to wonder if experts who are part of Federal bureaucracies are entirely capable of delivering their true appraisals. Max Weber says as much in his speech "Science as a Vocation":

The large institutes of medicine or natural science are 'state capitalist' enterprises, which cannot be managed without very considerable funds. Here we encounter the same condition that is found wherever capitalist enterprise comes into operation: the 'separation of the worker from his means of production.' The worker, that is, the assistant, is dependent upon the implements that the state puts at his disposal; hence he is just as dependent upon the head of the institute as is the employee in a factory upon the management. For, subjectively and in good faith, the director believes that this institute is 'his,' and he manages its affairs. Thus the assistant's position is often as precarious as is that of any 'quasi-proletarian' existence and just as precarious as the position of the assistant in the American university.³⁷

Kevin Ryan sent the following letter to Frank Gayle of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), the governmental body that claims to scientifically support The Official Story:

This story just does not add up. If steel from those buildings did soften or melt, I'm sure we can all agree that this was certainly not due to jet fuel fires of any kind, let alone the briefly burning

fires in those towers. That fact should be of great concern to all Americans. Alternatively, the contention that this steel did fail at temperatures around 250C suggests that the majority of deaths on 9/11 were due to a safety-related failure. That suggestion should be of great concern to my company.

There is no question that the events of 9/11 are the emotional driving force behind the War on Terror. And the issue of the WTC collapse is at the crux of the story of 9/11. My feeling is that your metallurgical tests are at the crux of the crux of the crux. Either you can make sense of what really happened to those buildings, and communicate this quickly, or we all face the same destruction and despair that come from global decisions based on disinformation and “chatter”.

Thanks for your efforts to determine what happened on that day. You may know that there are a number of other current and former government employees that have risked a great deal to help us to know the truth. I've copied one of these people on this message as a sign of respect and support. I believe your work could also be a nucleus of fact around which the truth, and thereby global peace and justice, can grow again. Please do what you can to quickly eliminate the confusion regarding the ability of jet fuel fires to soften or melt structural steel.³⁸

[Kevin Ryan testimony: <http://www.youtube.com/v/5euZtUSxRjY>]

Why hasn't this story been told by the mainstream media?

There have been few exceptions to the biased presentation of The Unofficial Story in established

media sources. One example is the way in which the magazine Vanity Fair portrayed the documentary "Loose Change."³⁹ This example illustrates the tensions between the ideological views of reporters and their editors, as well as the necessity of established news sources to confront emerging sources of new media. "Loose Change" has become massively popular on Google Video and serves as a good introduction to key components of The Unofficial Story. Reporter Nancy Jo Sales fairly presents the views of the film's producers, yet concludes "There is no conclusive evidence in Loose Change of U.S. government involvement in 9/11. The film relies too heavily on already published reports, some of which have been discredited."⁴⁰ Interestingly, Sales presents a different view in her blog, which of course would be uncontrolled by Vanity Fair editors. In her blog (intriguingly referencing "Citizen Kane" with its title of "Rosebud"), she is much more interested in exploring The Unofficial Story. For example, on 10/26/06, she wrote "One possible explanation is that the Towers fell as the result of a controlled demolition. Strike it from your mind, if you can, that this is a 'conspiracy theory,' and ask yourself if it is not a logical explanation, given the evidence."⁴¹ How many other journalists have serious doubts about 9/11 but are prevented by their editors from expressing these doubts in print?

CONSPIRACY THEORIES

Bush himself established The Official Story as "the truth" (while condemning anyone who would think otherwise) during his speech before the UN on 11/10/01:

"We must speak the truth about terror. Let us never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning the attacks of September the 11th, malicious lies that attempt to shift the blame away from the terrorists themselves, away from the guilty."

It is suspicious that a mere two months after 9/11, Bush somehow foresaw the emergence of The Unofficial Story. The phrase "conspiracy theories" was established as a supposedly definitive dismissal of anything that contradicted The Official Story. In recent years, Fox News and other mainstream media outlets have relentlessly labeled The Unofficial Story as a "conspiracy theory," without ever discussing Operation Northwoods, the mysterious collapse of WTC7, or the "coincidence" of hijacking drills that took place on 9/11. Why? These elements of The Unofficial Story are often the most likely points to cause someone to wonder if in fact it was an inside job. These points threaten the ruling ideology.

For the website "What Really Happened," Robert Lederman writes:

"The 'conspiracy theories' Bush is referring to similarly have three basic premises and many divergent subsets. The first is that the attack was known about (and possibly, planned) by various elements of the U.S. government before 9/11 and was allowed to take place in order to bring about certain conditions, including the suspension of our guaranteed civil liberties. The second premise is that even if bin Laden and the al Queda network based in Afghanistan were immediately responsible for the attack, that those supporting, funding and protecting them are not for the most part based in Afghanistan but are in fact closely connected to the Bush

administration. . . The third premise is that a U.S. built oil pipeline through Afghanistan which has been in the planning stages for more than a decade is the real goal of the war and that a U.S. invasion of Afghanistan was in the works long before September 11th."⁴²

The phrase “conspiracy theories” has several connotations. Firstly it connotes “untruth.” Also, “paranoia” and “nut.” The phrase “conspiracy theories” is also utilized by the White House to vilify terrorists, as can be seen in this press release:

Terrorists recruit more effectively from populations whose information about the world is contaminated by falsehoods and corrupted by conspiracy theories. The distortions keep alive grievances and filter out facts that would challenge popular prejudices and self-serving propaganda.

*The ability of terrorists to exploit the Internet and 24/7 worldwide media coverage allows them to bolster their prominence as well as feed a steady diet of radical ideology, twisted images, and conspiracy theories to potential recruits in all corners of the globe.*⁴³

The use of the phrase can easily be viewed as a targeted smear against anyone, despite their credentials, who questions the ruling ideology.

Rupert Murdoch, owner of Fox News and various newspapers, has publicly acknowledged the role that oil played in the motivation for going to war. In an interview for The Bulletin on 2/12/03, he stated, “The greatest thing to come of this to the world economy, if you could put it that way, would be \$US20 a barrel for oil. That's bigger than any tax cut in any country.”⁴⁴ And

Bill Moyers recently pointed out that Murdoch still "has no regrets, that he still believes it was right 'to go in there,' and that 'from a historical perspective' the U.S. death toll in Iraq was 'minute."⁴⁵ Murdoch clearly has demonstrated his allegiance with the dominant material relationships of our time, as well as a lack of empathy for working-class soldiers. So it is therefore fair to suspect that he may be consciously disseminating views that serve the interests of the ruling class through his media channels.

Fox News network has all the hallmarks of a modern propaganda machine. It consistently appeals to a brute nationalist instinct, framing issues for the least intelligent members of our country with language that is reminiscent of propaganda from The Third Reich. This has been analyzed by such documentaries as "Outfoxed," and is widely accepted by progressives. There is a demonstrated pattern that seeks to induce the ruling-class ideology through sheer repetition of crude slogans. For example, during the 2004 election, all hosts of Fox News programs were ordered to frame John Kerry as a "flip-flopper." The power of television to shape political debate was made apparent as the phrase "flip-flopper" became part of the common parlance. A similar pattern can be seen with the dissemination of the phrase "conspiracy theory" as applied to the 9/11 issue. As The Unofficial Story became wildly popular through the internet, word-of-mouth and the sharing of burned DVD's of popular unofficial story movies such as "Loose Change" and Alex Jones' documentaries, the establishment press was forced to confront the issue. Otherwise, they would appear to be consciously ignoring an obviously popular subject. Predictably, they framed The Unofficial Story as a "conspiracy theory" without attempting to seriously ask whether or not this conspiracy theory is true. This attempt to discredit The Unofficial Story is obvious when you view the following clips:

This clip of the show Planet Mancow, which aired 11/18/06, shows the host ridiculing serious points raised by Kevin Smith, who is the producer of the Alex Jones Radio Show:

[<http://video.google.com/googleplayer.swf?docId=6405967520683085303&hl=en>]

Another clip shows Bill O'Reilly browbeating a young girl named Molly Sessler, who keeps an open mind regarding 9/11. Is this a targeted effort to intimidate students who do not accept The Official Story?

[<http://www.youtube.com/v/gTQy06azJws>]

Noam Chomsky and Edward Hermann would call this "flak." As described by their Propaganda Model, Herman/Chomsky define flak as targeted efforts to discredit organizations or individuals who disagree with or cast doubt on the prevailing assumptions which are favorable to established power. The other guest is Jenna Pryor, who is the young managing editor of The Medota Beacon. The Mendota Beacon is a free, privately funded newspaper first published on February 12, 2005. It is politically conservative and was formed in 2004 as a conservative alternative to liberal papers. Interestingly enough, the paper received its start-up capital from the Leadership Institute⁴⁶, which is a non-profit organization located in Arlington, Virginia that teaches "political technology." The Institute's mission is to "identify, train, recruit and place conservatives in politics, government, and media" through a variety of programs offered at the Institute's Arlington headquarters or at its many training seminars held around the United States, mostly on college campuses. As of August 2006, the Leadership Institute had trained more than 52,125 students.⁴⁷ Pryor is a product of the coordination between conservative think-tanks and

mainstream media channels. Her example demonstrates how the ruling ideology is transmitted to younger generations.

PUNISH ANYONE WHO REJECTS THE DOMINANT IDEOLOGY

Micheal C. Ruppert, David Ray Griffin and Tarpley are three researchers who convincingly argue for The Unofficial Story. While I tend to subscribe to this hypothesis of what actually occurred on 9/11, it has become a common occurrence that my communications with people who believe The Official Story are unable to even comprehend The Unofficial Story, let alone subscribe to it. This may be due primarily to the fact that The Official Story was sugarcoated and made easily digestible by the mainstream media establishment, whereas contemplating The Unofficial Story requires a disinterested and arduous examination of physical evidence and testimony of those involved. Dr. Kevin Danaher, a progressive activist who subscribes to The Unofficial Story (and husband of Green candidate Medea Benjamin) noted that "Asking people to accept [The Unofficial Story] is like asking someone to take a drink from a firehose - it can be way too much all at once." His point illustrates the power of the ruling ideology. It's hard to change people's minds after The Official Story has been seared into their consciousness through the repetition of the established press.

The fact that questioning 9/11 is taboo further hinders the revelation of facts. For example, Ruppert's book "Crossing The Rubicon: American Empire at the End of the Age of Oil" was not even published in America. Ruppert had it published in Canada, and once shipped into the USA, it was relegated to dusty corners of alternative bookstores. Does this fact speak to dissatisfaction

with Ruppert's thesis by American publishers and booksellers, or is his thesis actually too dangerous or controversial? In other words, is it too hot to handle? Ruppert, who ran a website called FromTheWilderness.com, experienced an office break-in where nothing was stolen but every computer was busted into pieces. This year he fled to Venezuela, literally fearing for his life. Also Griffin, who had a history of having books published, met resistance when he approached publishers about a book about 9/11.

Consider that American academics that have come forward in support of The Unofficial Story have had their careers threatened by campus administrators and/or state representatives. Steven Jones, a Brigham Young University professor of physics, had been actively investigating whether there was chemical evidence of demolition explosives on the steel beams of the twin towers (an investigation that was quite pertinent to The Unofficial Story). After his theories surged in popularity on the internet, Brigham Young administrators chose to place him on paid leave.

"BYU will conduct an official review of Jones' actions before determining a course of action, university spokeswoman Carri Jenkins said. Such a review is rare for a professor with 'continuing status' at BYU, where Jones has taught since 1985."⁴⁸

Kevin Barrett is the professor at the University of Wisconsin who was featured in the O'Reilly clip. His career has also been threatened by Wisconsin state representative Stephan Nass, who has called Barrett's theories ludicrous. Other members of the organization Scholars For 9/11 Truth have also faced similar harassment and even death threats for questioning The Official

Story.

Journalists have also faced harassment. Christopher Bollyn, an independent journalist who was tracking down different threads of The Unofficial Story, was recently beaten and falsely imprisoned by an undercover team of police agents in Chicago.⁴⁹ He had recently reported that Benjamin Chertoff, lead researcher for Popular Mechanic's piece on 9/11 Conspiracy Theories, was in fact the cousin of Department of Homeland Security chief Michael Chertoff.⁵⁰ Care to fact-check that? After being set loose, Bollyn also decided to stop researching the issue and possibly leave America. Another example is Air America host Mike Malloy. Shortly after he began having prominent researchers of The Unofficial Story on his show, he was dropped from the network.⁵¹

Felluga discusses post-Marxist Louis Althusser's distinction between overt repression versus ideological guiding:

"Most subjects accept their ideological self-constitution as "reality" or "nature" and thus rarely run afoul of the repressive State apparatus, which is designed to punish anyone who rejects the dominant ideology. Hegemony is thus reliant less on such repressive State apparatuses as the police than it is on those Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) by which ideology is inculcated in all subjects."⁵²

Questioning an administration that declares that "You are either with us or with the terrorists" threatens any researcher with the spectre of Guantanamo. Under conditions such as these, where the free exchange of ideas is curtailed by violence or threats of violence, the empirical search for

truth is greatly hindered. Skilled researchers who may otherwise be able to help settle the matter will be affected by the potential threats to their livelihoods. Fortunately, the facts that support The Unofficial Story have been well documented and preserved on thousands of websites. For pesky freethinkers like Bollyn who pursue truth wherever it leads, the secret police may be dispatched. Yet police repression calls attention to what an author has written. While Gestapo-like tactics of the Department of Homeland Security may terrify 9/11 researchers, the message that is censored becomes highlighted in neon. Whereas in other totalitarian regimes, a message might have been largely eradicated by killing the messenger, with today's internet and its capabilities, it is much harder to suppress a message that has found its way to cyberspace. And for America, once our cherished right to Free Speech is met with violent resistance that seems to have the hallmarks of totalitarian repression, the illusion of "Freedom" is threatened. This may have long-term effects on the ruling class's ability to inculcate a false class-consciousness for the ruled.

THE INTERNET AS A REVOLUTIONARY PRESS

The very fact that so many high-level former officials⁵³ have expressed their grave doubts about The Official Story without being given widespread coverage by the mainstream media is proof that something is seriously wrong with the way our media operates. For truly, if this is not "news," then what is? For this reason alone, I find internet news sources who tell inconvenient truths to be much more trustworthy than establishment news sources who are at best unaware of these stories, and at worst covering them up. Given Marx's discussions of press ownership, it

seems pretty obvious that mainstream news sources are actively ignoring this information because it does not serve the class interests of the owners. Also considering that the CIA has a history of infiltrating newspapers through programs such as Operation Mockingbird, and the Bush administration has been caught bribing reporters and producing fake news, I think it is safe to say that American mainstream news sources are completely compromised. They should be seen essentially as propaganda. The veracity of their news reports is highly suspect for the above reasons. Just as we easily understand how the Nazis bought up all the presses prior to WWII and understand the power this gave them over the German ideology and discourse, we should understand that the fairly recent consolidation of the American media corporations has created a tightly controlled system of information systems that then disseminate the ruling ideology. As researchers of empirical truth, we should be impressed with the internet's ability to facilitate free discourse, not bothered by the fact that it is also a haven for pornography and UFO stories.

Considering that the 9/11 Commission did not establish a conclusive account of what happened on 9/11, we should all be ready to look at independent research with fresh eyes. One thing we can say for sure is that independent researchers who publish information on the internet are not subjected to the same pressures as American bureaucrats. They cannot have their pensions threatened and they cannot be ordered to remain silent by their superiors. The ownership of the internet is vague. It is essentially controlled by the U.S. military, yet it has become an essential part of our daily lives. Anyone can put up a webpage. In the Marxist sense, almost everyone can now own a press. Just as the invention of the covert, portable press had a significant effect upon the French Revolution, the widespread availability of the internet has likewise created a revolutionary situation of information sharing that can counter the ruling ideology. The power of

hyperlinks and digital storage has brought about tremendous changes to the way information is shared.

"The people now have a digital memory and collective intelligence," notes former intelligence agent Robert D. Steele in his 10/7/06 review of Webster Tarpley's book "Synthetic Terrorism." Steele's wikipedia entry notes that he was a Marine Corps infantry and intelligence officer for twenty years and a former clandestine services case officer with the Central Intelligence Agency.⁵⁴ He also runs a website, www.oss.net, which advocates a new approach to intelligence gathering which utilizes the curiosity of American citizens instead of seeking to delude them. In the book review, Steele writes "The author suggests that there is no conclusive evidence that 9/11 was of foreign origin, and to the contrary, quite a bit of evidence that the hijackers had been trained at US military bases, protected by the CIA and FBI, and that the end result of their actions--including controlled flying into buildings and controlled demolitions bringing down three towers, one of which was not hit at all, all suggest a US-based conspiracy." Steele himself writes, "I am forced to conclude that 9/11 was at a minimum allowed to happen as a pretext for war. . . and I am forced to conclude that there is sufficient evidence to indict (not necessarily convict) Dick Cheney, Karl Rove and others of a neo-conservative neo-Nazi coup d'etat and kick-off of the clash of civilizations."⁵⁵

APPENDIX:

THE WELL OILED MEDIA written anonymously, 9/16/01

<http://www.kirbymountain.com/rosenlake/media_oil.html>.

Where are the moderating voices, the views of those who stand against the momentum of war, who challenge the self-serving rationalizations of empire? You are unlikely to find them in the major media.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is headed by Bob Coonrad, formerly deputy managing director of the U.S. propaganda station Voice of America. At the helm of National Public Radio is Kevin Klose, formerly director of the International Broadcasting Bureau, which oversees Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Radio and Television Marti. [Klose in September 2002 was in Rhinebeck, New York, arguing the necessity of attacking Iraq.] The chairman of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is Michael Powell, son of the secretary of state.

[March 2003: Clear Channel, the Texas-based owner of more than 1200 radio and 36 television stations in the USA, with its own syndication and tour management divisions, has been organizing rallies in support of invading Iraq. They also maintain and enforce a list of banned songs and musicians for their stations. Vice chairman Tom Hicks made George W. Bush a multimillionaire by buying the Texas Rangers baseball team from him. As one of the creators and the first chairman of the University of Texas Investment Management Company (with Clear Channel founder Lowry Mays on the board) when Bush was governor, he turned over the control of its funds to companies close to the Bushes, including The Carlyle Group mentioned below. Clear Channel's growth has depended on continued deregulation and lax oversight by the FCC and has its own lobbying office in Washington.]

Secretary of State Colin Powell was on the corporate board of America Online, now merged with

Time-Warner, which owns CNN. A member of AOL/Time-Warner's board of directors, Carla Hills, also sits on the board of directors of Chevron. She was the first President Bush's trade representative. On the board of directors of Exxon-Mobil sits J. Richard Munro, former chairman and CEO of Time-Warner. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld was on the board of the Tribune Company, owner of the Chicago Tribune, the Los Angeles Times, Newsday, and many other newspapers as well as TV stations.

[November 2003: Hollinger International board members are charged with pocketing tens of millions of dollars received from other companies. Hollinger is a media company, owned by Conrad Black, that owns the Daily Telegraph in London, the Chicago Sun-Times, and the Jerusalem Post. Hollinger Digital is their investment division and is headed by Richard Perle, who is on the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board, which is essentially an industry liaison office (Perle was chairman until questions of propriety forced him to another seat). He also heads Trireme Partners, which is aggressively investing in "homeland security" projects, and steered \$2.5 million from Hollinger to Trireme. Gerald Hillman, also on the Defense Policy Board, invested \$14 million in Trireme and became a partner. Henry Kissinger is a director at Hollinger and a Trireme advisor. Another Hollinger director is Richard Burt, a former arms negotiator. The Carlyle Group (see below) is considering bailing out Black.]

Oil companies often share board members with the media. The director of Texaco (recently merged with Chevron), former senator Sam Nunn, is also on the board of directors of GE/NBC (GE is the nation's sixth largest defense contractor). Texaco board of directors member Charles Price sits on the New York Times/Boston Globe board of directors. Corporate board member William Steere is on the board of directors of Dow Jones/Wall Street Journal. A member of the Dow Jones/Wall Street Journal corporate board, Rand Araskog, also sits on the board of directors of Shell Oil.

The connections of the current White House administration with big oil hardly need mentioning. Most notably, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice comes from the board of directors of Chevron -- which has a tanker named for her -- and Vice President Dick Cheney (secretary of defense during the first Bush presidency) was chairman and CEO of Halliburton, which provides construction and maintenance services to the oil and other energy industries as well as field support to the military. Although he sold most of his stock when he made himself Bush's running mate, he retains about \$8 million in stock options and continues to get up \$1 million a year in separation pay. Over 200 former employees of Enron, the fabulously cynical and corrupt energy broker based in Texas, have found jobs in the current Bush administration. A significant investor in President Bush's early oil ventures was the bin Laden Group, a multinational construction conglomerate based in Saudi Arabia. The bin Laden Group has also invested in The Carlyle Group, a global investment firm headed by James Baker (the elder Bush's secretary of state) and Frank Carlucci (secretary of defense under Reagan and a close friend of the current secretary of defense). Former President Bush himself is a senior advisor. John Major (former prime minister of the U.K.) is the group's European chairman. Fidel Ramos (former president of the Philippines) is an advisor. One of their operations in Saudi Arabia is an official part of the government. Much of their focus is defense and energy, and they also own a stake in multinational conglomerate Vivendi's publishing operations.

All of these oil companies, with important ties to the U.S. media, have interests in the Middle East crucial to their profits. Another company, Unocal, was the major player in a January 1998 agreement with the Taliban to build a natural gas pipeline across Afghanistan. (The U.S. had covertly funded the Taliban to bring stability for the pipeline deal.) In December 1998, they put the project on hold "until an internationally recognized government was in place." Unocal runs its own political action committee and is a major donor to the Republican Party. They spend about \$1.5 million every year for lobbying.

Robert Oakley, U.S. ambassador to Pakistan in the 1980's and instrumental to the CIA support of the Afghan Mujahedin (in which Osama bin Laden became a commander), now works for Unocal. One of the Mujahedin's leaders, Hamid Karzai, was the main intermediary between the Mujahedin and the CIA. He later became a top advisor to Unocal and after the ending of Taliban rule in Afghanistan was installed as prime minister. Henry Kissinger also works for Unocal. Secretary of the Air Force under the elder George Bush, Donald Rice, is on Unocal's board of directors. (Rice is also a former president of the military think tank RAND.) Another board member is Charles Larson, former commander-in-chief of the U.S. Navy's pacific command. Former RAND employee and Unocal advisor Zalman Khalilzad is now the National Security Council's advisor for southwest Asia. Afghanistan-born Khalilzad was also an advisor to the state department in the 1980's and is a close associate of Vice President Cheney and Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz. [On December 31, 2001, Khalilzad became special envoy to Afghanistan.]

The Soviet Union estimated that Afghanistan sits on 5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, 95 million barrels of oil, and 400 million tons of coal. Unocal has stated that "Afghanistan's ... potential includes proposed multi-billion-dollar oil and gas export pipelines." The vice president of Unocal testified in 1998 to a U.S. House committee about the importance of stabilizing the potential oil fields of central Asia and that the best pipeline route for transporting their oil is across Afghanistan to the Pakistani coast. A cheap supply of natural gas is needed by a huge Enron-built power plant in Dabhol, on the west coast of India.

As with our response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, and to the overthrow of Siad Barre in Somalia, a war in Afghanistan (or new ones in Somalia and Iraq) will not be to relieve the suffering of its population or to defend against a serious threat to democratic and civil rights. In the name of terror's victims, war will be pursued to protect future profits for those making, as well as those reporting, the decisions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

Griffin, David Ray. The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11. Interlink. 2004

Rockefeller, David. Memoirs. Random House; 1st Trade edition. 2002

Ruppert, Michael C. The Decline of the American Empire at the End of the Age of Oil. New Society Publishers. 2004

Tarpley, Webster. 9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA. Progressive Press; 3rd edition. 2006

Unger, Craig. House of Bush, House of Saud, The Secret Relationship Between the World's Two Most Powerful Dynasties. Gibson Square. 2004.

Websites:

www.8thestate.com/

www.oss.net

www.infowars.com

www.911blogger.com

Articles:

Blau, Herbert. "Art and Crisis: Homeland Security and the Noble Savage" *Paj: A Journal of Performance and Art*, September 2003, Vol. 25, No. 3 (PAJ 75), Pages 6-19

Butterfield, Bradley. "The Baudrillardian Symbolic, 9/11, and the War of Good and Evil"
Postmodern Culture, 13.1 2002

Cloud, Dana. "Therapy, Silence, and War: Consolation and the End of Deliberation in the 'Affected' Public" *Poroi*, 2, 1, August, 2003

Constantine, Alex. "Mockingbird: The Subversion Of The Free Press By The CIA"
[<http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/RANCHO/POLITICS/MOCK/mockbird.html>]

Dean, Tim. "Art as Symptom" *Diacritics* 32.2 (2002) 21-41

Denton, Robert. "Language, Symbols, and Media" *Society*, Nov/Dec 2004.

Nadel, Alan. "Paranoia, Terrorism, and the Fictional Condition of Knowledge" *Contemporary*

Literature, Vol. 43, No. 2. (Summer, 2002), pp. 406-421.

Postel, Danny. "Noble lies and perpetual war: Leo Strauss, the neocons, and Iraq"

<<http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article-3-77-1542.jsp>>

Ramazani, Vaheed. "September 11: Masculinity, Justice, and the Politics of Empathy"

Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East. 21.1-2 (2001) 118-124

Russell, John. "Terrorists, bandits, spooks and thieves: Russian demonisation of the Chechens before and since 9/11" Third World Quarterly, Volume 26, Number 1 / February 2005

Spence, Louise. "Teaching 9/11 and Why I'm Not Doing It Anymore" Cinema Journal 43, No. 2, Winter 2004.

Zizek, Slavoj. "The Parallax View" New Left Review 25 Jan/Feb 2004.

- 1 Posted by DZ. "Overview of New National Zogby Poll on 9/11 Coverup." *911blogger.com*. 5/22/06.
10/13/06. <<http://www.911blogger.com/2006/05/overview-of-new-national-zogby-poll-on.html>>
- 2 Lemnitzer, L.L., et. al. Operation Northwoods. 9 Mar 1962. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20010430/>>.
- 3 Shane, Scott. "Vietnam Study, Casting Doubts, Remains Secret." *nytimes.com*. 31 Oct. 2005. 13 Oct. 2006.
<<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/10/31/politics/31war.html?ex=1288414800&en=c2f5e349563a32d9&ei=5088&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>>.
- 4 Editorial. "The Times and Iraq." *nytimes.com*. 26 May 2004. 13 Oct. 2006.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/26/international/middleeast/26FTE_NOTE.html?ex=1165554000&en=d5e525b5e32cdacd&ei=5070>.
- 5 Kurtzman, Daniel. "Donald Rumsfeld Quotes." *politicalhumor.about.com*. n.d. 6 Dec, 2006.
<<http://politicalhumor.about.com/cs/quotethis/a/rumsfeldquotes.htm>>.
- 6 Felluga, Dino. "Modules on Marx." *cla.purdue.edu*. n.d. 6 Dec. 2006.
<<http://www.cla.purdue.edu/english/theory/marxism/modules/marxideology.html>>.
- 7 Rockefeller, David. Memoirs. Random House, 2002. p. 405.
- 8 Watson, Paul Joseph. "Rockefeller Predicted "Event" To Trigger War Eleven Months Before 9/11." *prisonplanet.com*. 28 Oct 2006. 6 Dec 2006.
<http://www.jonesreport.com/articles/281006_rockefeller_911.html>.
- 9 Harris, Tom. "The World Trade Center." *howstuffworks.com*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://people.howstuffworks.com/wtc2.htm>>.
- 10 Anonymous. "Larry Silverstein." *wikipedia.org*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Larry_Silverstein>.
- 11 Anonymous. "Rockefeller Family." Wikipedia.org. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rockefeller_family>.
- 12 Felluga.
- 13 Schoen, John. "Oil industry awash in record levels of cash." *msnbc.msn.com*. 21 Jul 2005. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/8646744>>.
- 14 Unger, Craig. House of Bush, House of Saud. Gibson Square, 2004.

- 15 Behan, R.W. "The Surreal Politics of Premeditated War" *commondreams.org*. 3 Dec 2006. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.commondreams.org/views06/1203-21.htm>>.
- 16 Anonymous. "The Well Oiled Media." *kirbymountain.com*. 16 Sep 2001. 6 Dec 2006. <http://www.kirbymountain.com/rosenlake/media_oil.html>.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Anonymous. "The Well Oiled Media." *kirbymountain.com*. 16 Sep 2001. 6 Dec 2006. <http://www.kirbymountain.com/rosenlake/media_oil.html>.
- 19 Felluga.
- 20 Behan. See also: Ruppert, Michael. Crossing The Rubicon. New Society Publishing, 2004. See also: Griffin, David Ray. The New Pearl Harbor. Interlink, 2004.
- 21 Anonymous. "Military-Industrial Complex." *wikipedia.org*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military-industrial>>.
- 22 Smith, Kevin. "UPDATED: *Pentagon Papers* Author Daniel Ellsberg Says 9/11 Deserves Further Investigation." *infowars.com*. 19 Jul 2006. 6 Dec 2006. <http://www.infowars.com/articles/terror/pentagon_papers_author_gov_maybe_did_911.htm>.
- 23 Donelly, Thomas. "Rebuilding America's Defenses." *newamericancentury.org*. Sep 2000. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>>.
- 24 Tychoстup, Lorna. "Framed: The Politics of Language." *chelseagreen.com*. Jul 2006. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.chelseagreen.com/about/politicsandpractice/news/july1>>.
- 25 Lemnitzer, L.L., et. al. Operation Northwoods. 9 Mar 1962. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20010430/>>.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Anonymous. "9/11 Commission: Opposition and Obfuscation." *americanprogress.org*. 7 Apr 2004. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2004/04/b44775.html>>.
- 28 Anonymous. "9/11 Commission." *wikipedia.org*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/9/11_Commission>.
- 29 Arnold, Laurence. "9/11 panel to get access to withheld data." *boston.com*. 13 Nov 2003. 6 Dec 2006. <http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2003/11/13/911_panel_to_get_access_to_withheld_data>.
- 30 Anonymous. "The White House Has Played Cover-Up." *democracynow.org*. 23 Mar 2004. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=04/03/23/1546256>>.
- 31 Boehlert, Eric. "The president ought to be ashamed" *salon.com*. 21 Nov 2003. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://dir.salon.com/story/news/feature/2003/11/21/cleland/index.html?pn=1>>.
- 32 Zelikow, Philip. "Thinking About Political History." *millercenter.virginia.edu*. 15 Oct 1998. 6 Dec 2006. <http://millercenter.virginia.edu/pubs/mc_report/vol14_num3.pdf>.
- 33 Freeh, Louis. "An Incomplete Investigation." *opinionjournal.com*. 17 Nov 2005. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110007559>>.
- 34 Edmonds, Sibel. "Public Letter to 9/11 Commission Chairman from FBI Whistleblower." *commondreams.org*. 1 Aug 2004. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.commondreams.org/views04/0802-06.htm>>.
- 35 Jones, Alex. "Alex Jones Responds To Ben Chertoff, Popular Mechanics 9/11 Debunking

- Campaign.” *prisonplanet.tv*. 3 Sep 2005. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://prisonplanet.tv/audio/090305alexresponds.htm>>.
- 36 Caddell, Joseph. “Deception 101--Primer on Deception.” *iwar.org.uk*. Dec 2004. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www.iwar.org.uk/psyops/resources/ssi/primer-on-deception.htm>>.
- 37 Weber, Max. Science as a Vocation. Originally a speech at Munich University, 1918, published in 1919 by Duncker & Humblodt, Munich. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www2.pfeiffer.edu/~lridener/DSS/Weber/scivoc.html>>.
- 38 Ryan, Kevin. Letter to Frank Gayle. *prisonplanet.com*. 12 Nov 2004. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/november2004/121104easilywithstood.htm>>.
- 39 Sales, Nancy Jo. “Click Here For Conspiracy.” *vanityfair.com*. Aug 2006. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www.vanityfair.com/ontheweb/features/2006/08/loosechange200608>>.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Sales, Nancy Jo. “Rosebud #43.” n.d. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://nancyjosales.com/blog>>.
- 42 Lederman, Robert. “GW Bush on 9/11 Conspiracy Theories.” *whatreallyhappened.com*. 21 Dec 2001. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/wackyconspiracy.html>>.
- 43 Anonymous. “Strategy for Winning the War on Terror.” *whitehouse.gov*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nsct/2006/sectionV.html>>.
- 44 Walsh, Max. “The Murdoch Interview.” *bulletin.ninemsn.com.au*. 12 Feb 2003. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://bulletin.ninemsn.com.au/article.aspx?id=133057>>.
- 45 Moyers, Bill. “Message To West Point.” *commondreams.org*. 29 Nov 2006. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www.commondreams.org/views06/1129-21.htm>>.
- 46 Anonymous. “The Mendota Beacon.” *wikipedia.org*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Mendota_Beacon>.
- 47 Anonymous. “Leadership Institute.” *wikipedia.org*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leadership_Institute>.
- 48 Walch, Tad. “BYU places '9/11 truth' professor on paid leave.” *deseretnews.com*. 8 Sep 2006. 6 Dec 2006. <<http://deseretnews.com/dn/view/0,1249,645199800,00.html>>.
- 49 Bollyn, Helje. “Christopher Bollyn Arrested in Chicago.” *rblive.com*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://rblive.com/Bollyn.html>>.
- 50 Bollyn, Christopher. “Chertoff's Cousin Penned Popular Mechanics 9/11 Hit Piece.” *thetruthseeker.co.uk*. 7 Mar 2005. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www.thetruthseeker.co.uk/article.asp?ID=2872>>.
- 51 Anonymous. “Mike Malloy.” *wikipedia.org*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mike_Malloy>.
- 52 Felluga, Dino. "Modules on Althusser: On Ideology." Introductory Guide to Critical Theory. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www.purdue.edu/guidetotheory/marxism/modules/althusserideology.html>>.]
- 53 Anonymous. “Senior Military, Intelligence, and Government Officials Question 9/11 Commission Report.” *wanttoknow.info*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<<http://www.wanttoknow.info/officialsquestion911commissionreport>>.
- 54 Anonymous. “Robert David Steele.” *wikipedia.org*. n.d. 6 Dec 2006.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_David_Steele>.
- 55 Steele, Robert David. “Among Hundreds of Books, The Strongest Approach to Truth.”

amazon.com. 7 Oct 2006. 6 Dec 2006.

<http://www.amazon.com/gp/discussionboard/discussion.html/ref=cm_rdp_st_rd/002-6919675-8200042?ie=UTF8&ASIN=0930852370&store=yourstore&cdThread=Tx2ZU8WJKCVSEV&viewID=R1LNNW9GMEILN5&iid=0930852370&displayType=ReviewDetail>.